

REMARKS

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action mailed September 19, 2006. In order to advance prosecution of this case, Applicant amends Claim 22 without prejudice or disclaimer. The amendment to this claim is not the result of any Prior Art reference and, thus, does not narrow the scope of any of the claims. Furthermore, the amendment is not related to patentability issues and only further clarifies subject matter already present. All of Applicant's amendments have only been done in order to advance prosecution in this case. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the pending claims and favorable action in this case.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant notes with appreciation the Examiner's allowance of certain pending Claims. In order to advance prosecution of this case, Applicant has authorized an Examiner's amendment [outlined below], and amended Independent Claim 22 to address the Examiner's remaining concerns.

Claim Objections

The Examiner rejects Independent Claim 1 because of certain drafting/line indentation informalities. Applicant cannot ascertain what exactly is being objected to here. Applicant apologizes if *their* oversight is causing this misinterpretation of the objection. Applicant hereby empowers the Examiner to execute any Examiner amendments that address line indentation issues. This should resolve this issue and this imperfection should no longer inhibit the patentability of the pending claims.

Section 101 Rejections

The Examiner rejects Independent Claim 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 101, suggesting that the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicant does not express any opinion as to the propriety of this rejection at this time. Applicant presumes that this rejection is based on current United States Patent and Trademark Office guidelines. Applicant has complied with the Examiner's request and made a small amendment to address the Examiner's concern. Should this amendment not suit the Examiner, or should the

Examiner need further clarification on this issue, Applicant welcomes any dialogue from the Examiner, as the Examiner is invited to simply contact Attorney's for Applicant at the number listed below.

Accordingly, all of the pending claims have been shown to be allowable as they are patentable over the references of record. Notice to this effect is respectfully requested in the form of a full allowance of these claims.

CONCLUSION

Applicant has now made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. For the foregoing reasons and for all other reasons clear and apparent, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims.

Applicant believes that no fees are due. However, if this is not the case, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any amount required or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-0384 of BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.

If there are matters that can be discussed by telephone to advance prosecution of this application, Applicant invites the Examiner to contact Thomas J. Frame at 214.953.6675.

Respectfully submitted,

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.
Attorneys for Applicant


Thomas J. Frame
Reg. No. 47,232

Date: December 8, 2006

Customer Number: **05073**